

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Official Action of March 15, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. The indication that claims 20-22, 24-29, 46, 48-48, and 50-55 are allowed is appreciated.

Applicants believe the remarks below will demonstrate the novelty of the instant claims. However, should the Office not be persuaded, the courtesy of an interview is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14, 16, 18-19, 23, 30-40, 42, 44-45, 49, 56-59 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Carneal at al. (6,847,626).

The instant claims are directed to a method for communicating with a large number of remote satellite locations comprising *simultaneously* in random access mode communicating with a plurality of a first set of remote terminal devices and communicating with a plurality of second remote terminal devices in a dedicated mode *using the same overlapping time slot within one* of a plurality of channels.

Carneal describes a communication system having three types of communication resources: a contention-type access mode, a first non-contention-type access mode, and a second non-contention-type access mode. All the modes share the same communication channel resources.

Carneal uses the first non-contention mode to transmit a packet that has collided in the contention-type mode. The second non-contention mode is used for notification purposes. That is, when data has been transmitted in the contention-type mode, a notification is sent via the second non-contention mode. This notification allows the system to determine whether the packet was transmitted successfully in the contention mode or whether it collided. If it collided, the packet is resent through the first non-contention mode.

Although Carneal describes using the *same channel resources* in both contention mode and non-contention mode, Carneal does not teach or suggest using the resource for both contention (random access mode) and non-contention (dedicated access mode) at the same time. That is, in Carneal, the channel is used *either* as contention mode or as non-contention mode but *never both* at the same time.

See, for example, in column 6, lines 4-9, Carneal describes TDMA channels to subdivide the communication resources. This allows remote units to be *assigned a time slot* in which to transmit. By limiting transmissions to fall within the assigned time slot, the remote units are able "to share the communication resource provided by the hub station." That is, TDMA (Time Division Multiple Access) is truly Time *Division*, not time overlapping.

In view of Carneal, one skilled in the art would not have overlapped traffic of "non-contention" type with traffic of "contention" type in the same time slot, because the non-contention traffic may collide. Thus, Carneal does not teach or suggest allocating a time-slot as "dedicated" to one VSAT, while other VSATs are allowed to use the *same* time slot.

In contrast, the instant claims *allow* random access by some VSAT to a *single time-slot* which has been dedicated to some other VSAT. In other words, a collision between a packet sent in dedicated mode and a packet sent in random access mode is possible and intentionally allowed. This arrangement allows overlapping between random access traffic and dedicated access traffic. The dedicated access traffic is provided with a re-transmission mechanism, for example, to resolve any possible collisions. Thus, in the instant claims, the *same time-slot* can *simultaneously* be allocated to two or more VSATs, one in dedicated mode, and the others in contention. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.


Claims 15 and 41 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Carneal in view of Ho (6,747,959). Ho does not remedy the defects of Carneal. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the instant rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are requested. If any additional fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

By: 
Susan A. Wolfe
Registration No. 33,568

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

Dated: July 14, 2006